

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 03 2007

## REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are allowable. The Office rejected claims 1-4, 7-14 and 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LaPierre (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,466). The Office rejected claims 5-6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaPierre. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

LaPierre does not disclose or suggest the specific combinations of claims 1, 7, 11, 17 and 22. For example, LaPierre does not teach or suggest "applying one of a plurality of distinctive types of call waiting ring tones based upon the redirecting number."

In contrast, LaPierre discloses a "distinctive ring to identify ... that the call has been redirected from another number ..." Thus, LaPierre provides the same ring for all redirected numbers rather than one of a plurality of distinctive types of call waiting tones based on the redirecting number. LaPierre does not teach or suggest a plurality of distinctive types of call waiting tones. Further, LaPierre does not teach or suggest applying a distinct type of call waiting tone based on the redirecting number. Thus, claims 1, 7, 11, 17 and 22 are allowable.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, claims 2-4 are allowable, at least by their dependency from claim 1.

Claims 8-14 depend from claim 7, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, claims 8-14 are allowable, at least by their dependency from claim 7.

Claims 18-21 depend from claim 17, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, claims 18-21 are allowable, at least by their dependency from claim 17.

Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, claims 23-25 are allowable, at least by their dependency from claim 22.

Claims 5-6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over LaPierre. LaPierre does not teach or suggest the specific combinations of claims 1 and 11, as discussed above. Thus, claims 1 and 11 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a). Claims 5 and 6 which depend from claim 1 are allowable at least by their dependency from claim 1. Claim 15 which depends from claim 11 is allowable at least from its dependency from claim 11. Thus, claims 5-6 and 15 are allowable.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

7-3-2007  
Date

  
Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER SCHAFFER LLP  
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5575 (fax)